	N2s2SmiS kjc	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
2	x	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	New York, N.Y.
4	V •	21 Cr. 280 (AKH)
5	JAYQUAN SMITH,	
6	Defendant.	
7	x	Sentencing
8		February 28, 2023 11:05 a.m.
9		11.05 a.m.
10	Before:	
11	HON. ALVIN K. HELLERSTEIN,	
12		District Judge
13		
14	ADDEADANCEC	
15	APPEARANCES DAMIAN WILLIAMS United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York	
16		
17	BY: ALEXANDRA ROTHMAN Assistant United States Attorne	
18	Assistant united states Attorne	ξY
19	DAVID TOUGER Attorney for Defendant	
20	Accorney for Defendant	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counsel, please state your

(Case called)

appearances for the record.

MS. ROTHMAN: Good morning, your Honor. Alexandra Rothman for the United States.

THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Rothman.

MR. TOUGER: Good morning, your Honor. David
Touger --

THE COURT: Remain seated.

MR. TOUGER: Good morning, your Honor. David Touger for Mr. Jayquan Smith.

THE COURT: Good morning. Good morning, Mr. Smith.

Mr. Smith, I am deeply sorry that we could not arrange our facilities to allow you to visit your son in the funeral home and to tend to his funeral. There are few things more sad than when a son precedes the death of a parent, and not to be able to see that person is a very serious matter. I hope you forgive me.

Let's start now. I am here to sentence you,

Mr. Smith. Have you read the presentence investigative
report?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Have you discussed it with Mr. Touger?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Touger, are there any factual errors

24

25

Ten.

1 that you want me to correct? 2 MR. TOUGER: Not at this point, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: At any point? 4 MR. TOUGER: They have all been made correct, your 5 Honor. 6 THE COURT: Okay. 7 Government? Ms. Rothman? 8 MS. ROTHMAN: I have, your Honor. No corrections. 9 THE COURT: The facts are as stated in the presentence 10 investigative report. 11 Before I get into the calculation, Mr. Smith pleaded 12 quilty to Count Seven and Ten. One of those counts is a count 13 that charges a crime for having a gun in furtherance of a 14 violent crime. Since the violent crime is an attempt, how can we consider it a crime of violence as contemplated by the 15 Supreme Court in *United States v. Taylor*, a decision of 2022? 16 17 MS. ROTHMAN: Your Honor, I am not sure the Court 18 needs to engage in the attempt analysis given that the charge 19 is also an assault with a dangerous weapon. And so I think 20 the Court could find that the assault with a dangerous weapon would qualify as a crime of violence. 21 22 THE COURT: The crime he pled quilty to was Count 23 Ten.

Count Seven charges attempted murder and assault with a

MS. ROTHMAN:

He pled guilty to Count Seven and Count

dangerous weapon in aid of racketeering under 18 U.S.C. 1959(a)(3), (a)(5), and 2.

THE COURT: The crime with which he is charged in Seven is racketeering. The caption adds "assault with a dangerous weapon," but there is no allegation that that is the crime. That is a means for committing the crime and not a categorical element of the crime, because racketeering can be accomplished in various ways that involve nonviolent activities.

MS. ROTHMAN: Your Honor, if I may, Count Seven charges the defendant with a violent crime in aid of racketeering, not with just racketeering, like a racketeering conspiracy. That's Count One. And so, your Honor, I would submit that Count Seven, the violent crime in aid of racketeering, is a crime of violence such that Count Ten — actually let me clarify the defendant pled guilty to two counts—Count Seven and Count Ten.

Count Seven charges a violent crime in aid of racketeering. There is no issue with that charge, as I see it, even in light of Taylor.

Count Ten charges a use of a firearm in connection with a different crime of violence, which is actually the crime of violence charged in Count Nine. That's for the December 21, 2020 shooting.

If the Court is concerned --

1	THE COURT: Give me a moment.	
2	MS. ROTHMAN: Yeah, no problem.	
3	(Pause)	
4	THE COURT: Again, it raises the same problem.	
5	MS. ROTHMAN: Your Honor, I would want to look back	
6	at the law on what the government's position is with respect	
7	to attempted murder following the Taylor decision. Taylor, if	
8	I recall, involved Hobbs Act attempted robbery. I don't	
9	believe it involved an attempted murder offense.	
10	THE COURT: That's true, but the nature robbery by	
11	its nature is a violent crime. It's a crime that, through	
12	force, coercion, or the like, takes property from another. An	
13	attempt is not necessarily a violent act.	
14	MS. ROTHMAN: Your Honor, I think—and, again, if the	
15	Court would like briefing, I think we could adjourn today's	
16	sentencing and put in a letter to address the Court's	
17	questions with respect to this, but	
18	THE COURT: On the present record, I would not add	
19	any element I would not add the mandatory minimum to Count	
20	Ten.	
21	MS. ROTHMAN: So, your Honor, I think, then, in light	
22	of that	
23	THE COURT: I would take that into consideration in	
24	punishing for Count Seven.	
25	MS. ROTHMAN: Your Honor, I think what I would like	

to do is brief for the Court the question the Court has raised with respect to the attempted murder, the 924(c) based off of an attempted murder. My recollection is that our office is still taking the position that it is a crime of violence, but I would like to put that --

THE COURT: I believe that's right. I believe that you take that position.

MS. ROTHMAN: But I would like to --

THE COURT: You took that position with all attempts. Indeed, I felt the same way.

MS. ROTHMAN: I think our position, again, I would like to put it in writing for the Court's review. I do think that the defendant has pled guilty to a crime that carries a mandatory minimum sentence, he's pled guilty to engaging in multiple shootings, and it's important that the Court considers all of that in advance of sentencing.

THE COURT: He did, he did, he certainly did, and I accepted the plea. But the legal sufficiency of an indictment is not satisfied by a plea. If the count is legally insufficient, that can be raised at any time.

MS. ROTHMAN: I understand that, your Honor.

THE COURT: We might as well get it raised now.

If I sentence on the basis that Count Ten stands as it is with this seven-year mandatory minimum, and even though I might sentence to a larger amount under Count Seven, it

would be back from the Second Circuit if the Second Circuit agrees with *Taylor* and extends it to this kind of a case. So we might as well resolve it now.

MS. ROTHMAN: Okay.

THE COURT: We can resolve it in the wrong way, it's also true, but what do you think, Mr. Touger?

MR. TOUGER: Your Honor, just to add my two cents, that is the government position, which is why the plea offer is where it is. And they are still maintaining that to this day, as being, Ms. Rothman stated, *Taylor*, they are saying --

THE COURT: What are you saying, that you want to take back your plea?

MR. TOUGER: No. I'm not saying that, your Honor.

That's why we took the plea, because we don't -- the government had their position, but the Court can solve the problem itself. As the plea agreement states and we all know, the Court has last say over what is legal and what is not.

THE COURT: I missed you. Sorry. Say that again.

MR. TOUGER: The plea agreement and we all know that the Court has the last say on what the guidelines will be and what is legal and what is not. So I would agree with the Court that there is no reason to brief it because we are just going to be back here where we are right now. The government is going to have that position, which we feel is incorrect, which obviously the Court feels is incorrect. So I don't think

wasting time, money, and effort in briefing is necessary. I think the Court should move forward with its suggestion.

THE COURT: I think the briefing is necessary because I have to decide — the issue I have to decide in the best way I can, and it will be better to have a consideration of the government's position and yours.

MR. TOUGER: Well --

THE COURT: There is another question, too, that I need to explore, and that is whether there is an upward adjustment for using a gun. I know that Mr. Smith was first charged with being a felon in possession. That charge has disappeared in the superseders.

MR. TOUGER: Yes.

MS. ROTHMAN: I wouldn't say it disappeared. The defendant -- in the superseding indictment, the felon-in-possession charge was included. That is the S1 indictment. The defendant's plea contemplates that he pled guilty to two counts, and while he didn't plead guilty to the felon-in-possession charge, it was included in a footnote that he acknowledged and admitted that on the day in question he in fact possessed a gun and discharged it.

THE COURT: Well, that's part of the crime that you are charging in Ten.

MR. TOUGER: Correct.

MS. ROTHMAN: Not exactly, your Honor. The crime in

Count Ten is based off of a December 21, 2020 shooting. The crime that the defendant was charged with being a felon in possession for was a shooting on April 21 of 2021.

THE COURT: But you want me to take all three incidents into account when I sentence.

MS. ROTHMAN: I think the Court should, your Honor, yes.

THE COURT: Yes, so -- as related acts.

MS. ROTHMAN: Correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: So I am asking, am I taking it into consideration, is there an upward adjustment for a use of a gun if I don't consider the gun charge as a charge in itself because it's --

MR. TOUGER: Well, my suggestion would be no, because the plea agreement doesn't contemplate that in its calculations, that he should -- the Court can certainly consider that.

THE COURT: What's no?

MR. TOUGER: Well, that there shouldn't be another -- added points to his guidelines calculation. The Court can certainly consider those acts.

THE COURT: I don't understand. I get what you mean.

I can consider those acts, but without adjusting the guidelines.

MR. TOUGER: Exactly, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes. I can use it, for example, in varying upwards from the guidelines.

MR. TOUGER: Excuse me?

THE COURT: I can use it, for example, in varying upwards from the guidelines.

MR. TOUGER: I would hope the Court wouldn't but, yes, it could.

THE COURT: I know you want me to give him seven years.

MR. TOUGER: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: But your thinking may be in error, too, because you are assuming that that is a legally sufficient charge.

MR. TOUGER: Well, no, your Honor, my thinking was taking everything -- when you look at the case from a 30,000 foot level I did not want to go to trial because the guidelines would have been obviously a lot higher and the punishment would have been a lot higher. This was the plea that was offered, so that's why we took it. My feeling is that seven years is not -- is a crime -- is a time that sort of fits the crime, so whether it's the mandatory minimum or not, I think seven years is adequate punishment.

THE COURT: For all of the reasons you have given in your submission.

MR. TOUGER: Exactly.

THE COURT: Okay. I understand.

So we should postpone this.

MS. ROTHMAN: We are happy to put in a letter that articulates why we still believe that --

MR. TOUGER: Your Honor, I --

MS. ROTHMAN: -- a crime of violence predicated on an attempted murder, a violent crime in aid of racketeering based on attempted murder is sufficient. I think that would be helpful so the Court has all the information in advance of sentencing.

THE COURT: I agree.

You were saying, Mr. Touger?

MR. TOUGER: I just don't see the value in the government repeating its position in a letter. We are just going to be back here with the Court in the same instance. The law is the law. The government is going to say they don't agree with it. I'm going to say I agree with it. And unfortunately, your Honor, you wear the robes and you have to make your decision.

What I would suggest is that we continue with the sentencing for the very reason that Mr. Smith has been in the MDC for 25 months and the MDC is just a horrible place, still is, even after COVID, it still is basically they sit in lockdown almost every day and --

THE COURT: He would like to be assigned to the

facility --

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$ TOUGER: We would like to move the case forward and --

THE COURT: -- where he will serve.

MR. TOUGER: Right.

And I think the ultimate decision the Court is going to make is it can't use the mandatory minimum. I understand that, but it won't change my suggestion of what the sentence should be and I don't think it will change the government's position of what they think the sentence should being and, frankly, I don't think it would change the Court's mind of what it thinks the sentence should be.

THE COURT: I'm going to go ahead and sentence now, and I will hold that Count Ten refers back to the crime alleged in Count Nine. Count Nine alleges a crime of racketeering through a criminal enterprise, performing acts involving violent and nonviolent offenses.

For example, a distribution of controlled substances in violation of Title 21 would be considered a nonviolence offense and there are other nonviolent offenses, including the fraud committed on the New York disability insurance.

So on racketeering although it is alleged that it was committed in a certain way, which is a violent way, as alleged, in consideration for a payment or a promise to pay something of pecuniary value from the gang and for the purpose of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

enhancing his position in the gang, knowingly assaulted an individual with a dangerous weapon and knowingly attempted to murder and aided and abetted --

MR. TOUGER: Your Honor, nobody was injured at all in Mr. Smith's counts.

MS. ROTHMAN: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Attempted to murder.

MS. ROTHMAN: Your Honor --

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$ TOUGER: No assault, there was no assault, either. There was an attempted assault.

MS. ROTHMAN: Your Honor, if the --

THE COURT: I'm looking at the allegation.

MS. ROTHMAN: Your Honor, if the --

THE COURT: Knowingly assaulted.

MR. TOUGER: Yes, but Mr. Smith did not plead to any -- in none of Mr. Smith's shootings was anybody hit.

MS. ROTHMAN: He pled to attempting to kill, that's correct.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. TOUGER: Attempting to assault.

MS. ROTHMAN: If the Court is inclined to, I guess, vacate the Count Ten guilty plea, I think it is important that the government puts in legal authority on its position as to why the Court should not do that. That is for a couple of reasons.

Without Count Ten, the maximum sentence that the Court could impose changes quite dramatically in this case. There is a 20-year maximum sentence on Count Seven. With Count Ten, that maximum can go much higher. Probation has recommended quite a lengthy sentence, consistent with the government's recommendation, and I don't think it is appropriate to --

THE COURT: Probation has recommended ten years.

MS. ROTHMAN: No, your Honor. Probation has recommended --

MR. TOUGER: 17 years, your Honor.

MS. ROTHMAN: -- 17 years, your Honor, which I recognize is less than 20 years, but I do think that the Court should get it right, and I think it would be helpful for the government to provide the legal authority as to why --

THE COURT: I don't think there is binding legal authority.

MR. TOUGER: There is no legal authority for Count Ten, and my position would be, your Honor, even if you vacate Count Ten, the Court still has leeway to go anywhere it wants to go in sentencing.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. ROTHMAN: I'm not sure the defense can argue that the Court should vacate Count Ten under the plea agreement.

MR. TOUGER: I can't. I am just saying -- I'm not

arguing that --

THE COURT: I brought it up, right?

MS. ROTHMAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I brought it up, and I am sentencing today as if Count Ten is a legally insufficient count because attempt is not a crime of violence and racketeering is not necessarily a crime of violence applying the categorical approach involved in the Supreme Court decisions. All right. So that's where we are with that.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{Now}}$\sc{I}$$ am going to make the findings that I need to make as to the guidelines.

I think the calculation that both sides have come to in their agreement is 30, and the probation department wants to up that by considering Mr. Smith a career offender. I decline to do that. Again we run into attempts and whether they are violent offenses or not. So I think we have a level of 30 followed by eight criminal history points. Six have been calculated by the parties for the youthful offender attempts, robbery attempts, and two more because this crime was committed while Mr. Smith was still involved in parole under his previous offense. That puts us in offense level 30, criminal history category IV, which yields a range of custody of 135 to 168 months.

Before I finish off on this, is there an adjustment, upward adjustment because a gun was used?

MR. TOUGER: Sorry, your Honor. I didn't hear the question.

THE COURT: Is there an upward adjustment because a gun was used in the commission of the crime?

MS. ROTHMAN: Your Honor --

THE COURT: I did a quick look, and I couldn't find --

MS. ROTHMAN: Your Honor, I don't know the answer to that question. If I could just go back to the career offender calculation, I think for purposes of the guidelines the defendant's attempted robbery conviction still qualifies as a crime of violence, and that's under 4B1.2.

THE COURT: Yes, I know it says that, but I'm applying what the Supreme Court has been doing. I hesitate to call him a career offender. And I don't think it's apt because he is too young and I wouldn't call him a career. He was a youthful offender. Whether he straightens out or not, I don't know, but I don't think career offender fits the bill, and I'm not going to find it.

MR. TOUGER: Your Honor, as far as the other question, I would say the government is bound by the plea agreement as far as the other question.

THE COURT: Well, you tell me, Mr. Touger.

MR. TOUGER: Just like I can't argue -- I couldn't argue without the Court bringing up the dismissed Count Ten,

they can't argue to change the guidelines. They are locked in by the plea agreement.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not sure because I'm changing things so much that they are not. Customarily if you have a count that charges the illegal use of a gun, then you don't make the upward adjustment. What is the crime where it is an upward adjustment?

MS. ROTHMAN: I'm not sure I follow the Court's question, your Honor.

THE COURT: There is a place in the guidelines where you make a two-level upward adjustment. For an aggravated assault, you make a four- or five-point upward adjustment. An aggravated assault has not been charged.

MS. ROTHMAN: Is the Court thinking about the, like, 2A1.2 guidelines for aggravated assault with a dangerous weapon? I'm not sure I understand what section of the guidelines the Court is referring to.

THE COURT: I'm not. I'm hunting.

2A1.2, secondary, is second degree murder.

MS. ROTHMAN: 2A --

THE COURT: Aggravated assault, assault with intent to commit murder is 2A2.1.

MS. ROTHMAN: Right. And --

THE COURT: An aggravated assault is 2A2.2 and the upward adjustment for use of a gun is 2A2.2(b)(2).

MS. ROTHMAN: Right. But because the defendant has agreed that 33 is the correct base offense level for Count Seven, because it was — it would have been first degree murder, this is a premeditated attempt to kill, your Honor, there is no enhancement for gun, possession of a gun, and so I don't think there would be any additional points there.

If I thought I understood the Court's questions, that related to the April shooting which is sort of considered relevant conduct in this plea agreement, I don't think, as Mr. Touger noted, there is an upward departure from the guidelines, but I do think the Court can vary in light of sort of the repeat nature of the defendant's criminal acts.

THE COURT: All right, so I find that the guidelines yield at level -- I find that the net offense level is 30, that the criminal history category is IV, and that the recommended range of custody is 135 to 168 months. Do you agree with that? Your answer is, no, you don't.

MS. ROTHMAN: I don't, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. But assuming I am correct in my analysis with Count Ten, do you agree? I guess --

MS. ROTHMAN: I'm not sure I do either, because I think the Court should be -- in light of the Court's questions, I think the defendant qualifies as a career offender, and that's in light of his prior attempted robbery convictions.

25

THE COURT: All right. 1 2 How about you, Mr. Touger? 3 MR. TOUGER: I agree with the Court. THE COURT: I find 135 to 168 months as the indicated 4 5 range. 6 Now, I think the guideline provision for supervised 7 release is one to three years, am I correct? MR. TOUGER: Your Honor, I'm sorry. I missed that 8 9 question. 10 THE COURT: What is the extent of supervised release? 11 MR. TOUGER: I believe it is one to three years, your 12 Honor. 13 THE COURT: Yes. 14 MS. ROTHMAN: I think that's right, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: I so find. I have read all your materials, Mr. Touger, but make 16 17 believe I haven't and you can talk to me about your client. MR. TOUGER: Thank you, your Honor. I won't make 18 believe you haven't, because I know the Court has and the 19 20 Court has digested it, so I will try not to repeat myself. 21 THE COURT: Well, it's true. I can summarize it. 22 Mr. Smith grew up in an impoverished household. His 23 father was missing. His mother had to provide for I think four 24 She couldn't take care of the kids and provide. children.

ability to provide was quite meager. And so Mr. Smith lived

with his grandmother until she died, and he went back to his mother.

He made various efforts to lead a productive life, but he was unable to do so. Mr. Touger would have me believe that the circumstances that caused him to get involved with gang life and gang crimes were circumstances of necessity because of inability to provide, first, when he was younger because of conditions I mentioned before and, second, when he was older, when the pandemic caused a loss of his employment and he couldn't find other employment.

The government points out that Mr. Smith did not just simply engage in a crime of theft, which would be perhaps somewhat understandable in Mr. Touger's analysis to find money for food or other necessities, but it was a crime of violence, attempted robbery, and the circumstances of those robberies were pretty nasty. Given that and given difficulties of fighting in jail, the government feels that I should be considering Mr. Smith to the sentence that was agreed to in the agreement. That is something between 205 and 235 months.

All right, Mr. Touger, so we have a level between seven --

MR. TOUGER: Thank you.

THE COURT: -- years and 17 years or 18 years.

MR. TOUGER: Thank you, your Honor.

Your Honor, just picking up where the Court left off,

I want to refer the Court to the studies that I mentioned in my sentencing letter and how Mr. Smith's early life and teenage life affected his decision-making, really, abilities as he grew older. And the studies — and this is from a Harvard study of many thousands of people — show that it is almost like a post-traumatic stress disorder, in that their brain capacity is really weakened. It is not just the emotional problems that are faced by that, it is the fact that their actual ability to think through and make valid decisions is affected by their upbringing and their circumstances. And I think that's very important for Courts to start to consider in these situations as many young black, Hispanic, white impoverished people come before the Court in these situations.

THE COURT: But most living in that kind of circumstance are honest and don't commit crimes.

MR. TOUGER: I agree, your Honor. I'm not -- I don't want the Court to take my argument as an excuse or a reason, but it's as an explanation, and that some people do have the willpower to fight their way through and make it through and some people find some male role model to look up to. Some people have very strong family situation that gets them through, yes. Many, many people get through this situation in a completely lawful manner. But that doesn't discount the fact that what these studies show is that people who are brought up in this situation really do not have the brain

capacity that people who are brought up in my situation, and I don't know how the Court was brought up, but I would guess in the Court's situation. And even though my father passed away when I was nine years old, I grew up in a situation where I had family and family friends that sort of took over that role. I had many male role models to look up to, whereas Mr. Smith just didn't. His male role models were, as I said in my letter, the people who ran in the street, who got to him, and unfortunately he did not have the willpower and the strength to fight back from that, and I think the Court should first take that into consideration.

A. I think also the Court should take into consideration that he has spent 25 months in the MDC, which means that he began his sentence — his incarceration during the height of the COVID virus, and the MDC was even worse than it is now then. It was just a horrible place to be. And I'm sure the Court has heard these arguments and knows full well, so I won't go into detail about everything that was going on back in the jail over two years ago.

Mr. Smith got COVID twice since he's been in the MDC.

But to be completely honest, the conditions haven't improved much. Even now that COVID numbers have waned, the conditions still haven't. Most people -- most days, I should say, the MDC is still in lockdown. They have a lack of manpower, which I don't truly understand since they closed the MCC, why they

didn't bring enough employees over to the MDC, but they haven't. And that is the excuse they continue to give, that they don't have the manpower to allow inmates any kind of life. They are literally locked down over 23 hours almost every day, and it is just inhumane to do that to people. There are no programs, or the programs keep getting interrupted. There is very little athletic activity. There is very little — Sunshine, forget it; it just doesn't exist. The conditions are poor. They are overcrowded. They are understaffed.

It is amazing. I have people who are in the MDC who were moved to Essex County to be incarcerated there, and they just — they feel like they have gone to a country club when they got to Essex County. The people in Essex County who have never been to the MDC feel like they are in the worst place in the world. But everything is relative. And Mr. Smith has spent 25 months already in the MDC.

But that's not even the worst punishment. And granted, again, this is not -- Mr. Smith realizes he is in jail because of his actions, and he takes full responsibility for those actions, as you heard from him in his letter and will hear from him after I am done, but not only -- his child was quite young when he went into jail. He missed his whole child's life, basically, since he is incarcerated. And then, even though the Court had ordered that he be allowed to watch

a videotape of his son's funeral, he was not allowed to do that. Basically he did not get to witness his son's funeral or wake or anything else.

THE COURT: This is his two-year-old son.

MR. TOUGER: His two-year-old son, yes, your Honor. And as the Court already mentioned, I can't think of anything worse than that. And I have to say, to Mr. Smith's credit, he took it much better than his family did. His family was quite angry. There were numerous phone calls to me during the day, complaining and yelling, but Mr. Smith himself was like, this is my fault. I did what I did, and this is what I have to live through. He was much calmer than I was and than his family was.

THE COURT: You have noticed, I'm sure, that the psychological impact of the crime and the punishment is worse for the family than it is for the defendant.

MR. TOUGER: Agreed, your Honor. No doubt. But I still was very impressed with how Mr. Smith, unlike a lot of clients I have represented, took full responsibility for why he was not at his son's funeral, whereas I have a lot of clients who would have been yelling and screaming at me and quite angry at the Court right now, and Mr. Smith --

THE COURT: Let me be open with you, so you can focus your remarks. I am looking at he is 24 years old, so he's had very little time to develop a life. But what I see in his

life are terrible things. So at a time when he was hungry and not getting enough food, he commits a robbery and what does he get out of the robbery? He gets out of the robbery a jacket.

MR. TOUGER: Are you talking about the state -- the one he has youthful offender treatment on?

THE COURT: Right. He got out, Take your jacket off and beat him up with his fist, kicking him in the face multiple times. And the second offense is much the same, it's a down jacket that someone was carrying.

MR. TOUGER: Your Honor, it --

THE COURT: He took it away from him and beat him up very badly. These are characteristics of violence.

MR. TOUGER: I understand that, your Honor. And first of all, the jackets are worth a lot of money to be sold. So the fact that he took a jacket doesn't mean that he wasn't getting money for it to support himself. But even --

THE COURT: But it's, it's --

MR. TOUGER: The violence part of it I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: And you don't need to have an education to know that it's wrong to take something from another and it's wrong to beat up another person and it's wrong to kick the other person in the face. You don't need education.

MR. TOUGER: You don't need education for that, your

Honor, and Mr. Smith certainly knows what he did was wrong. He's never said what he did was right, called for, productive, or anything else. What the studies — and I don't think the studies relate that this is the right activity. What the studies show is that their minds don't necessarily make the same connection that yours and mine do. And it's very hard for us to put ourselves in that position.

THE COURT: The problem I get is an inference that if things are bad, crime is okay.

MR. TOUGER: No, I'm not --

THE COURT: If things are bad violence is okay.

MR. TOUGER: Your Honor, I don't want the Court to get that that's my argument. I don't think he should go unpunished. I think seven years is a lot of time. Seven years would basically be one-third of his life almost.

THE COURT: But he used a gun on three different occasions.

MR. TOUGER: And I'm going to get to that, your

Honor. The gun violence that he is charged with here — and,

again, I don't condone it, I don't condone anybody having a

gun, I don't understand when our society will get to the point

that it will learn that and just ban bullets. Forget the guns.

There are too many guns on the street now. If they ban them

now, it wouldn't do anything. Just stop the production of

bullets and we would solve the problem.

THE COURT: If you are in a gang and you want a gun you can get a gun.

MR. TOUGER: Yes, exactly that's why this whole idea --

THE COURT: Legally or illegally.

MR. TOUGER: Exactly, your Honor. That's why, just to veer off the track for a second, I don't think gun control is the right idea. I think just banning the production of bullets, then we won't have any gun violence, because a gun is worthless without bullets.

But, anyway, getting to the point here, your Honor, he was not -- prior he did rob people when he was a much younger person. His gun violence here is all gang related. It's not against John Q. Public. It's not against the law-abiding citizens of his neighborhood or anything else. It's one gang against another gang. I'm not saying that's right.

THE COURT: In society, where there are many innocent people just minding their own business and walking on the street, and all of a sudden involved in a gang fight --

MR. TOUGER: And that did not happen here. Nobody got hit here.

THE COURT: It often happens.

MR. TOUGER: My point only is, your Honor, when we are judging crimes and making sentences, we are have in a very

strange business. We have to judge — there is gradations of all crimes. And what makes a crime worse is if he went and shot John Q. Public for a jacket. That would be a — is one way of using a gun. If he is threatened by another gang and uses a gun, while still a crime and still wrong and still something that shouldn't happen, it's a lesser crime than taking a gun to John Q. Public. That's the only point I am making.

And the Court has already sentenced a codefendant of his, Mr. Bell, to seven years for a shooting --

THE COURT: The city streets belong to the public, not $\ensuremath{\mathsf{--}}$

MR. TOUGER: Agreed.

THE COURT: -- to a gang.

MR. TOUGER: I couldn't agree more. But the Court has already sentenced Mr. Bell to seven years; and in his shooting, two people got hit. Now, granted, he only has one shooting that he is charged with. Mr. Smith has three shootings. I understand that. But it would be a joke for us to think — stand here and think that Mr. Bell, that was the only shooting that Mr. Bell ever did and Mr. Bell got seven years and two people got hit in his shootings. Other people charged in his indictment are getting much less than that.

So I am not asking you to give Mr. Smith probation or two or three years. What I am saying, your Honor, is that

seven years is a hefty sentence, and he has already been punished harsher in these first two years than anybody could have contemplated when getting arrested or when people put up the codes. Forget even the MDC conditions that he has lived through and the fact that he's lost his son and will never be able to spend another day with his son and didn't get to go to his son's final services.

Now granted that is his fault and he admits that and he has said that to me on more than one occasion, since this happened both in phone calls and today, but that doesn't take away from the fact that it did happen, and that that is weighing on his mind that what he did and is punishment to him. He understands that his actions have caused him to miss out on something and now he is — and his actions of threatening the public safety with a gun deserve to be punished, no doubt.

But I think the break between you and I, your Honor, is I think seven years is an extensive sentence. He will be 30 years old when he gets out of jail. He will have spent almost one third of his life in jail. That is an extensive sentence, and I would ask the Court to find that that meets its requirements, that it take into consideration both punishment and mercy, and fits the crime to Mr. Smith.

Mr. Smith, while certainly has committed crimes in the past, has also demonstrated to the Court that he can lead

a productive life. he had put the gangs and criminal activity behind him and was leading a productive life until the circumstances sucked him — literally sucked him back in. And I think the Court, while certainly can't — doesn't condone it, and there is no excuse for his actions about going back into criminal conduct, the Court can see some light in Mr. Smith that he did spend two or three years really being a public asset, working, taking care of his family.

His son was, you know, born with numerous problems, including autism. It was not an easy, you know, situation.

And so I think the Court should give — there is ample to not give him credit for, but there are some things in his life to give him credit for, and I think the Court can rest assured that Mr. Smith has now really learned his lesson. He certainly seems to have convinced me, and not every client I have has made that jump and has convinced me of that, but Mr. Smith has certainly convinced me, and I have been doing this 38 years. I know the Court has been doing it longer than me, but I have been doing this 38 years, not two or three, and Mr. Smith has certainly, I think, taken to heart what he has done and how it has punished society, punished his family and now will punish him. But I think he has learned his lesson and I don't think he will appear in another court.

THE COURT: He was punished pretty clearly in state court, two crimes of attempted robbery. You would think he

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 MR. TOUGER: We would have hoped, and I think he did, 3 and I think he proved that by getting out and doing --

THE COURT: You don't learn your lesson by further crime. He was not alone in losing his job in the pandemic.

MR. TOUGER: I agree, your Honor, and again --

THE COURT: I think we are repeating.

MR. TOUGER: Yes, we are.

would have learned his lesson, right?

THE COURT: Let me hear Mr. Smith. You are allowed to talk to me. Pull the mic up.

THE DEFENDANT: To address the Court, I take full responsibility of my actions and everything I done in the past; past when I did crimes that I did in the past, the state crimes, probably crimes I didn't even get arrested for I apologize for, and I take full responsibility.

I wrote a letter to address the Court, but it was just speaking on like me bettering myself for me and my son and getting out of New York. But now, like, that happened, like, I have to rewrite it, but I was dealing with the funeral, being denied, I didn't have enough time.

THE COURT: What happened to your son? Did he get sick.

THE DEFENDANT: He had cancer.

THE COURT: Cancer.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. So I didn't have enough time

to rewrite it because I was dealing with getting through this and dealing with being denied. But I knew being denied was my fault because I'm incarcerated. So I don't put that blame on nobody but myself. That's why I know now, like, I ain't going to appear in front of no more judges. I already missed out too much time on my son's life—walking, talking and now this. It's, like, I don't want to appear in front of more judges. I don't want to miss more time in my family's life.

That's pretty much it.

THE COURT: Ms. Rothman. Apart from Hassan Simmons, have I sentenced anybody else?

MS. ROTHMAN: Your Honor, I believe the Court sentenced James Bell to seven years, which was the mandatory minimum sentence in his case.

THE COURT: And what's the difference?

MS. ROTHMAN: Well, your Honor, Mr. Bell committed one shooting. Mr. Smith committed three. I recognize that in Mr. Bell's shooting two individuals were hit, and that's obviously a fact that the Court can, and I'm sure did, consider, although there was a plea to a mandatory minimum sentence. Mr. Smith is lucky that no one was killed during his repeated acts of violence.

I want to respond to some of the suggestions by

Mr. Touger that this Court should care less about the

defendant's violence because it was only gang related. So I

disagree with that strongly.

THE COURT: So what?

MS. ROTHMAN: But even if the Court were to put any stock in that argument, which I don't think it should, this defendant is going on a public bus, the same bus that hard-working New Yorkers take to go to work, to see their families, he is pulling out a gun—there is a photo of that in our sentencing submission—hopping off the bus, and is captured on video shooting at people.

And it didn't stop there. He did it again and then in April of 2021 --

THE COURT: What gathers from this, that he had formed an intention to do something, and it wasn't just something on the spur of the moment because he got caught in some kind of violent act. He planned it --

MS. ROTHMAN: Your Honor, this is a premeditated attempt to kill. The defense has stipulated to that guidelines in the plea agreement, and it's repeated. It's repeated, and you know it's premeditated based upon the surveillance video. You know it is premeditated because he is talking about his intent to kill the ops, the rival gang members, on social media, and that's also in our sentencing letter.

THE COURT: Yes, I've read your sentencing letter.

MS. ROTHMAN: So there is no argument here that, oh,

he got caught up in a moment, he was being shot at, so he retaliated. No.

THE COURT: I don't think he is making that argument.

MS. ROTHMAN: And that's simply belied by the facts, your Honor.

THE COURT: He is making the argument that twice he tried to fit into society, things went wrong, he couldn't stay with it, and now he will do it because he's learned his lesson. That's basically his argument.

MS. ROTHMAN: And I don't think the facts support that, your Honor. If I understand—and maybe I'm missing something—what defense counsel is pointing to is that for a period of time the defendant had a part-time job. But, your Honor, you can work and also be a gang member, and this individual admitted to his membership in the gang, admitted to acts of violence in furtherance of that gang. There is really nothing in this record to suggest he was trying to clean up his life and do the right thing and then just fell back into this. What you instead see—and this goes back to his robbery, so he was younger—is a pattern of escalating violence. Then it was robberies; now it's attempted murders, shooting at people in the streets of New York.

And I will just note this, your Honor, the last shooting, the April 2021 shooting, I remember learning about that, we had an open investigation, we were preparing to

indict him and many of his codefendants for their membership in the 800 YGz, and I get a phone call from a detective that I know who just sees him on the street shooting at somebody out of the blue.

They follow him. They apprehend him. They get the gun. We charge that on a complaint. And then, as the Court knows, we supersede in the indictment to add that as an offense. This is somebody who, if not stopped by these charges, would have —— I don't want to say he would have killed someone, because we don't know, your Honor, but I feel fairly confident to say that his acts of violence would have continued over the summer of 2021.

There is a problem with gang violence in New York
City, and it's because of people like the defendant who pull
out guns and shoot people and try to kill people on the
streets of New York. And a seven-year sentence sends a
message that this Court doesn't care. A seven-year sentence
would send the message that you can do this, and there are no
real consequences.

THE COURT: How about a 14-year sentence?

 $\operatorname{MS.}$ ROTHMAN: Your Honor, I think that the guidelines in the plea agreement --

THE COURT: Ms. Rothman, how about a 14-year sentence?

MS. ROTHMAN: Respectfully, your Honor, it's not

enough.

THE COURT: That's a lot of years.

MS. ROTHMAN: I understand that, your Honor. There is a public safety emergency.

THE COURT: He will be 38 when he gets out.

MS. ROTHMAN: Your Honor, this was repeated attempts to kill.

THE COURT: I understand.

MS. ROTHMAN: There's a plea agreement that we entered into. The guidelines there are higher. It's 205 --

THE COURT: I don't think they are justifiable, the guidelines. I tell you this --

MR. TOUGER: Your Honor, can I just respond?

THE COURT: No. You don't need to.

MR. TOUGER: There is just one -- I have to make one point, your Honor. Derick Bell is Jayquan Smith. Yes, they only caught him with one shooting. They are the same people.

THE COURT: I'm punishing Jayquan Smith.

MR. TOUGER: I understand that, but one factor the Court must take into consideration is the fact what codefendants got and Derick Bell and Jayquan Smith are the same. The only difference is that Derick Bell hurt two people, actually hit two people. The fact that Derick Bell was given a plea to a seven-year count because he only was charged with one act doesn't take into account the reality of the situation that Derick Bell and Jayquan Smith were running

with the same people and doing the same thing and the punishment should be the same. The Derick Bell sentence has just as much impact as the Jayquan Smith sentence.

THE COURT: Well, maybe I was influenced by the pleas. I have to be influenced by the plea.

MR. TOUGER: But the Court --

MS. ROTHMAN: Your Honor --

THE COURT: I am --

MS. ROTHMAN: -- if --

THE COURT: -- discouraged by the Second Circuit in punishing behavior that was not in relationship to the plea, so I'm going to stick to the plea, and I think I've got two things that I am thinking through here and I think I have resolved it.

One is that these were really bad acts and there is a necessity to gain respect of the community and to deter others from doing things like this and to punish the individual himself, to deter him. And all of these suggest a very stiff sentence.

On the other hand, he is a young man. I believe that everybody is remedial. I mean that everyone's got the spark of the divine in him, and it needs sometimes just to be fanned and furthered to come out. Maybe that's an idealist and romantic belief, but a human life is a terrible thing to waste in jail, and so I have to search for that which fits the crime

24

25

have not accepted.

```
but also fits the prospects of remediation.
1
 2
               MS. ROTHMAN: Your Honor, if --
               THE COURT: Yeah.
 3
 4
               MS. ROTHMAN: If I could just make two additional
 5
      points. When you look at the 3553(a) factors, they all lean
6
      in favor of a substantial sentence within the guidelines as
 7
      calculated by the government or the Court.
8
               THE COURT: And you think 14 years is not
9
      substantial?
10
               MS. ROTHMAN: I don't, your Honor. I think there are
11
      a couple of ways you could conclude that.
12
               If we are going to compare this to Mr. Bell, one
13
      shooting gives you seven years, so let's times it by three and
14
     make it 21. Now, I'm not sure the Court should do that.
15
      think the guidelines instruct when you are considering
      similarly situated defendants you are talking about national
16
17
      averages, not only the defendants in a particular case. But
18
      it can't be that the punishment for one is the punishment for
      three. And in fact --
19
20
               THE COURT: You are arguing under the guidelines that
21
      I have not accepted.
22
               MS. ROTHMAN: I'm sorry, your Honor?
23
               THE COURT: You are arguing about guidelines that I
```

MS. ROTHMAN: Your Honor, I --

THE COURT: I've accepted guidelines that go from 135 to 168 months, and I am proposing to sentence at the very top of that guideline.

MS. ROTHMAN: And I think your Honor has a basis to go above the guidelines that the Court has proposed in light of the repeat nature of the defendant's conduct. Those guidelines, your Honor --

THE COURT: But that puts him into category IV and -- look, I could vary. It doesn't really make a difference whether it's 14 years or 15 years or 16 years.

MS. ROTHMAN: Your Honor, I think there is a basis to vary to the top of what the Court is allowed to do under the 20-year statutory maximum here, and that is for — I think, simply put, the guidelines that the Court calculated only reflect one shooting. That's the first shooting. That's the MTA bus shooting. They do not account for the second shooting.

Now, I recognize the Court has ruled on the 924(c), but there is a December 21, 2020 shooting, and there is an April 21, 2021 shooting. Those are not reflected in the guidelines nor is --

THE COURT: All right. I'm ready to --

MR. TOUGER: Your Honor --

THE COURT: I'm ready to sentence.

MR. TOUGER: Okay.

THE COURT: I think we have heard --

MR. TOUGER: I would just say that one factor she is forgetting to mention to the Court is the one that sentences of codefendants must be taken into consideration and two codefendants have been sentenced, one exactly the same as Jayquan Smith, whether he did one shooting or three shootings —

THE COURT: I think you made the point. I have it. I am ready to sentence.

So what is a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes that are set out in more detail? The nature and circumstances of the offense certainly are an argument for a stiff sentence. The history and characteristics of the defendant argue the same way. A stiff sentence would reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law, and provide just punishment for the offense, and the same with deterrence of others and the individual.

That begs the question what is a stiff sentence?

There is no scientific methodology that can assure a judge that he is sentencing leniently or severely or just right. Truth is to say, I don't think I ever really get it just right. I think I am too lenient sometimes. I think I am too stiff sometimes. I never get the satisfaction of feeling I did just the right thing, and so here.

Mr. Smith, you are an intelligent man. You have will and you have strength, but you also have a weakness and that weakness gets you on the street and causes you to do bad things. And if you continue to do that, you are going to get killed or you will be in jail. No way to lead a life. You suffered a terrible tragedy in the death of your son, but you get on.

I am sentencing you to 168 months, which I consider stiff—it's 14 years—which I think a sentence needs to be, satisfying the conditions I read out in Section 3553(a). That brings you to a point where you get out of jail, you are 38 years old and, if you exercise good conduct, maybe a few years earlier than that. That may seem to you a long way off, but life can be long.

You have written to me about how you have wanted to turn yourself around, that you feel that you have seen enough courts and done enough bad things. Maybe. But maybe you will be tempted again.

I can't tell you that I feel confident that a 14-year sentence is the right one. I'm sure you feel it's too much, and I'm sure that Ms. Rothman feels that it's too little. But I think it is the best I can do. And what you need to do in those 14 years is to understand that if you are back to your old ways, it will be worse the next time. And if you don't get caught, you will get killed on the street. Is that a way

to live?

You are fortunate in finding a woman who loves you, and you have been together for a little while. Whether that -- I don't know how you continue your life, but you continue. You could find life, you could find hope, you could find love, and you can live responsibly, and that's what you need to do.

Following custody, I order a three-year period of supervised release subject to the conditions set out in the presentence investigative report. The mandatory conditions on page 25 I impose. And since you have been around drugs and you have a history of drug use, I will not suspend the provision for drug testing.

The standard conditions set out on page 26 and 27 are imposed.

I call your attention very much to the point of association with other people whom you know have committed crimes. Choose your friends. Choose your friends so that you are not tempted by what your friends do, that do bad things.

The special conditions provide for treatment programs, and the first two paragraphs, I impose them. There is a search requirement in the third paragraph on page 27. I impose that. There is a fourth provision that you not associate or interact in any way, including through social media websites, with any gang members or associates,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 particularly the gang you were involved in. I impose that.

You will be supervised by the district of your residence.

I am not imposing a fine. Mr. Smith can't afford a fine.

There is a mandatory special assessment of \$200 -- no, of \$100 because I have invalidated one the counts. There is a mandatory special assessment of \$100 which will be due upon filing of the judgment.

Restitution is not applicable here.

MS. ROTHMAN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything, Mr. Touger.

MR. TOUGER: Your Honor, I would only ask that the Court recommend to BOP that they place him in an institution close to New York.

THE COURT: Can you repeat that? I recommend what?

MR. TOUGER: That BOP place him in an institution as close to New York as possible.

THE COURT: Yes, he should be, if possible, institutionalized in a place close to New York to promote visitation from his family.

Anything else, Mr. Touger?

MR. TOUGER: No, your Honor.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Open counts, Judge.

THE COURT: Not yet.

I advise you, Mr. Smith, that you have a right of appeal. You should discuss with Mr. Touger whether or not you wish to appeal. If you wish to appeal, Mr. Touger, I instruct you to do so on a timely basis.

MR. TOUGER: According to the plea agreement, your Honor, he's waived his right --

THE COURT: I'm not interested in the plea agreement. That's for you to decide.

Mr. Smith, if you can't afford a lawyer, the government will provide a lawyer free of charge.

Are there open counts, Ms. Rothman?

MS. ROTHMAN: Yes, your Honor. We would move to dismiss them at this time.

THE COURT: We should dismiss them.

MS. ROTHMAN: And then, your Honor, I think I have done this, but I will just note the government's objection to the dismissal of Count Ten and also the finding that the defendant is not a career offender.

THE COURT: Well, I have already dismissed Count Ten in effect, so I will dismiss Count Ten, and you can appeal if you find error in that.

MS. ROTHMAN: I think I am just noting for the record that we object to the Court's dismissal of Count Ten.

THE COURT: And if Count Ten is invalidated, presumably you have another count as a felon in possession, so

I really don't know how to deal with the underlying counts. All those that are subsumed in the present indictment other than Count Ten or any previous indictment are dismissed. MS. ROTHMAN: I think that's sufficient, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Touger. MR. TOUGER: That's okay, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Good luck to you, Mr. Smith.